

**Stormwater Advisory Board**  
Meeting Minutes  
September 19, 2014

I. Welcome and Call to Order the regular meeting of the Stormwater Advisory Board was called to order at 3:06 pm on September 19th, 2014 in The W.A.T.E.R. Center by Chris Bohm (Chair).

**Present**

**Board Members**

Greg Allison  
Rich Basore  
Chris Bohm  
Hoyt Hillman  
Don Kirkland  
David Leyh  
Mitch Mitchell  
Joseph Pajor  
Jim Weber

**Absent**

**Board Members**

Gary Oborny

**City of Wichita Staff**

Jim Hardesty  
Scott Lindebak  
Sara Runyan  
Mark Hall  
Neil Vyff

**City of Wichita Staff**

Dale Goter (CMO)  
Don Henry

**Visitors**

Ron Graber  
Daniel Schrant  
Katie Miller  
Josh Golka  
Tobias Oker  
Kelsey McDonough

**II. Approval of Minutes**

Bohm opened the meeting by saying that on the agenda as item number two is the approval of minutes from the July meeting, however the minutes are not at the meeting for review. Bohm said that he would ask that the approval of the minutes be moved to next months meeting.

**III. Discussion of Offsite BMP Program**

Bohm informed the board that Trisha Moore is in route to the meeting. Ron Graber is here to visit about the program as well. Bohm informed the board that the City has hired Kansas State University to assist SWAB in a program of assessing the cost vs tons of silt in essence of removal in a WRAPS style program in a rural type setting vs dollars per tons of silt removed in an urban setting. Bohm said that he wanted to take a second to mention something that Scott has taken care of. Two months ago the board met as a committee and went over two proposals one from Terracon and the other from Kansas State University, the votes were cast and Purchasing tabulated everything and K State was awarded the contract, however Terracon was never notified after the fact until today that they were not selected.

Bohm said that he just wanted to make sure to put that on record. Lindebak informed the board that it was not as late as it seems and officially they (Terracon) would not have been informed until two weeks ago because he waits until the City Manager executes the contract. It would have been July or late August or September when the contract was sent to K State and that would have been the time to notify them (Terracon) and somewhere the ball got dropped. Bohm said that it has been done though and Scott called and spoke with Terracon. Bohm wanted to make this part of the record and apologize on behalf of SWAB if there was any action taken that offended Terracon on their notification. Bohm then turned the floor over to Ron Graber to discuss the study. Graber advised that Trisha wanted to visit with everyone as a whole because she has some questions about some resources within the city. She has a new graduate student that is a master student that has done some extensive lit review and will be assisting as well. Graber gave an update on the CIG and advised the board that they did not get the grant. Graber said that he thinks it was well written and all of the appropriate support letters were attached but in reviewing the list of approved grants there was no one with any kind of urban component funded. They knew that this may be a concern going with NRCS, there is a big push on soil health, and 70% of the projects funded seemed to be soil health. Basore asked Graber to expand a little on soil health. Graber said that he's talked about cover crops and that plays a big role in soil health. The idea is partially to have a growing crop on the field at all times, with residue & root mass this slows down soil and water leaving the field so there is a reduction of runoff. This is like doing an intensive crop rotation. The other part is the crops that have root crops there is good penetration into the soil breaking up compaction so there is better water infiltration from this method. NRCS is really pushing the mixes where you plant more than one species of crop, about six or seven allow those to grow and then terminate them. Some crops will die with the freeze if it's a summer one then it is usually terminated with a Round Up application. This is an area that there is a lot of interest, mainly from the no till farms. From a university stand point it's difficult to document what kind of sediment reduction or pollutant reductions we get from cover crop, we know from a soil health point it makes sense. It's something NRCS has taken a hold of in the last year and they are promoting it really hard, the no tillers are wanting to go into that arena. Graber went on to say that these are NRCS grants and that the soil health is one of their initiatives. Graber advised the board that since they didn't get the NRCS grant that they started to look at other sources where they could get dollars to do some of the things they had hoped to do with the NRCS grant. He said that he doesn't think that they would be able to do the actual BMPs on the ground but that they may be able to get the dollars for the research, education part of it. They think there may be some possibilities. The total dollars of on the grant would go down. He also went on to say that even if they can't get the grant dollars they are still going to do some work beyond what was outlined in the contract. Graber informed the board that when new people start at universities they get startup funds to help them get their program going and Tricia has some of that where she can pay some graduate student time. Alexie who is bio & Ag engineer that does a lot of modeling in more of a rural landscape, he was involved in the proposal as well and he is on board to help too. Graber thinks that they will still be able to do a little of the work that they intended to do with the NRCS money without any grant funds. It would be easier to do the project if there was assistance but some of the work can still happen but not as much as they had hoped. He went on to say that they may come back and ask for another letter in the next few months, the time that it took to write the previous grant and the lit and research Graber feels can be tweaked and used for another opportunity. Bohm asked Graber if there were any grants on the list that were like this one city vs rural, Graber replied that he did not see the list of applications so he is not sure he only saw the grants that were funded and there were no urban components funded. Pajor asked Graber to give the board an idea on how much the grant would have paid out. Graber said that there was a pretty big chunk of money that was for BMPs but he was not sure how much. Pajor then asked if it was going to actually be paid to the producers to make the improvements to then be able to study. Graber replied yes, and then Pajor

asked if the same was going to be done for someone on the urban side of things and the answer was yes. Pajor then went on to say that where he was going with the questions was that maybe there was an alternative funding for the research, measurements and analysis piece because that sounds like it is more broadly available, then some sort of cooperative arrangements that have to do the BMPs or volunteer to do them. On the rural side, he is not sure there is anything to offer but conceptually give the producers something that would allow them to come up with the upfront money in the study phase that they then could benefit from and still be successful. Graber said that was an excellent point and there was actually a discussion about something like that. Discussion went on about NRCS and what they are interested in funding and the presentation that Ron & Tom Stiles went to in Topeka KWEA (Kansas Water Environment Association). Kirkland then asked Graber how the TMDLs would be included in the program. Graber said that he would let Basore answer that question. Basore replied that point sources are all carrying NPDES permit and they are working under limits to what is allowable in their discharges. It varies a little on what the pollutant of record is, if its nutrients, this is pretty well known and controlled but as the city's NPDES permits come up for renewal there has been an effort to spur them on to improve their sewage treatment ability for nutrient reduction, even though they weren't in violation of a TMDL there was one of concern out there. Basore went on to say that TMDLs get reviewed on a regular basis, they do stream monitoring in different watersheds around the state on a rotating basis and they have taken a number of streams off of the 303 D list and got them D listed for various pollutants of concern through WRAPS type of work. The TMDLs will vary some over time, depending on the activity in the watershed, depending on the rain fall. Bohm then said he had a question, he asked if there was an association of cities out of the state of Kansas; Kansas City, Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Lincoln, NE, Denver who could be contact or through a group be contacted to see if anyone else would like to get in on the idea and help share the funding to get an appropriate body of work put together for EPA and a model ordinance that would allow this. Lindebak said the best organization would be the American Public Works Association, they have a fall conference in Wichita next month. Someone would need to talk to leadership in that organization and see if that would be something that could be discussed. Hillman then stated that there is a statewide WRAPS groups that report feedback that could be tied in as well. Weber then asked if in the agriculture industry are there private foundations that are interested enough to spend money on research. Graber then stated that there are monies available. Farm Bureau, Corn Growers, those kinds of funds. He said he was not sure if they provide the kinds of funds on the scale that this group is looking at. Bohm then asked what EPA will want as documentation, and he briefly went over the program. What will EPA ask for in the way of documentation, are there grants with new program that can be secured to do the follow up research. Basore then said that this is on two levels, the most critical level is the load reduction and what are you achieving and can you document that. They are not as concerned where the funding is coming from but both KDHE & EPA like to see collaboration, where there are partners, value added, the more people you have on a list as participating doing something, it looks good and sells better. The other thing is can this be replicated elsewhere. Jim Hardesty joined the conversation saying that there may be a national association that may interested in this program. Bohm said that he would like to see a policy that is ready when the study is done so that it can all be turned into KDHE and then they can forward to EPA for review. Trisha Moore & other guests made it to the meeting, Bohm turned the floor over to her. Moore opened by introducing her guests. Kelsey McDonough & Tobias Oker, they will be doing the modeling to come up with the efficiency ratios or what needs to be done on the ag side to offset the urban. She advised the group that there is another opportunity that they will be submitting for on the research side. Moore went on say that as part of their research she needed a contact to get in touch with to see what kind of permitting needs to be done. Bohm advised that would be Scott Lindebak, and then asked what else Moore needed from the SWAB for her research. Moore replied that she first wanted to meet with Scott to get started and then they could work from there. Hillman then said that he had a question

for Moore & Scott, regarding the actual monitoring, saying that he thinks there will be an initial requirement to establish an additional monitoring stations in the city and upstream, would Scott have access to funds to do some of the initial work or if the baselines are already there. Lindebak said that the baselines are totally there and there is a new permit in August and they are now required to be sampling first flush for rain events that are more than one inch within 24 hour period upstream of the Arkansas River and downstream which is by Derby there are also five other streams that have to be sampled. What has not been done, which is part of the permit, is sample load reductions from construction BMPs and that is not required until 2017, in 2019 the load reduction has to be tabulated on the structural BMPs that were installed. Graber then asked if there was staff that to take samples and asked if the lab in town was used. Lindebak said that the lab in town was used to sample test the bacteria but lately the bacteria has been sent to a Salina company. Graber asked if the samples were routine or runoff events, Lindebak said that it was just runoff events, four times a year. Moore asked if they were grab samples, Lindebak replied yes. Moore said that if there are practices and they can't collect the data or have the data then they can make some assumptions based on literature, Bohm said that Weber had an idea at another meeting, saying that WRAPS programs know how many tons of silt they collect or prevent from going into the streams in a year and you know their budget that is a pretty simple equation. Graber said that this can be calculated pretty easy from information that they have. Hillman said that he wanted to make sure that the same measuring will be used both in rural and urban so that the data will hold up. Moore said that she will make sure to use some comparable data. Bohm then asked Moore how they would the money be taken from in town to out of town. He said that is of interest to him because this will be one of the sticking points in any program that is forwarded to KDHE or EPA. Bohm asked if there are other questions that the board wants to ask K State to think about. Lindebak said that the more options the better. Bohm asked if there were other comments or suggestions. Allison asked if the Corps of Engineers could do off site mitigation for projects and get mitigation credits, is this something that can be reviewed as part of this process too. Bohm said that the discussion came up but the conclusion was that the board would like to not mix the Corps mitigation issues with the urban stormwater issues. Bohm then asked if there are other questions or comments. Graber than thanked the group for the opportunity for the contract. Bohm than thanked Moore, her colleagues, and Graber for coming.

#### **IV. Meeting Time & Date Change**

Bohm turned this over to Lindebak who expressed that some board members asked him if the time could change due to other conflicts that they had. Bohm said to open it up for discussion. Discussion ensued about different times and dates. The final outcome was that the new meeting time would be at 8am on the second Friday of the month with the next meeting being October 10<sup>th</sup>. The location was not yet chosen as city staff needed to check on the availability of the WATER Center. Graber advised that if the WATER Center is not available that the Sedgwick County Extension Office may be able to assist. Bohm then said that is a great option if the other is not available to the board and asked if city staff could inform the board once this information had been ironed out. Motion was made by Mitchell and seconded by Leyh.

**ACTION:** *Notify SWAB of new time & advise of location by meeting notice*

#### **V. Agenda for October Meeting**

Bohm asked what the agenda should be for October, Hillman suggested a report back on monitoring techniques. Moore said that she could report on plans. Bohm asked if there was not report from K State what other items could be put on the agenda for the next meeting. Lindebak asked if the permit has been shared with anyone since the last meeting in July, Bohm said that would be a good agenda item. Bohm said that if the report was short than maybe an email update could be sent or Graber could

fill the group in. Bohm also said that the board really needs to start talking about funding. He said that he would like to kick off the meeting talking about funding at the next meeting. Bohm asked any other items that need to be talked about. Leyh asked if Lindebak could send out the permit before the meeting, Lindebak replied that he would do that. Pajor said going back to the funding that there should be a subcommittee that could give some options over funding. Bohm said that he likes that idea but he thinks that at the next meeting the board needs to bullet point the pros & cons and get some frame work for thought that the board could move forward with.

**ACTION:** *Agenda items: quick report from Moore about findings, review permit, bullet point funding options for frame work*

#### **VI. Adjournment**

Bohm then asked if there was anything else, being none he said that he would entertain a motion to adjourn. Unknown board member motioned and unknown board member seconded and meeting was adjourned time unknown.